

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the Examiner's comments in the rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ryder, cited, in view of DE '481, also of record, the claim has been amended in an effort to define the disclosed production method more distinctly.

The Examiner has held that Ryder discloses that "the bearing eye surface is processed **for a precise fit** (emphasis by applicants) to a circular cylinder before the anti-friction coating 18, 20, 22, 24 is applied ... to the processed bearing eye surface in a thickness 'corresponding' to the final dimensions" because Ryder describes on page 2, col. 2, lines 10-30, that the coating can be applied onto "the finished or smooth bearing material receiving surface" and this meets the claimed limitation "because 'finished' could be considered 'processed'".

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner reads the Ryder patent in the light of applicants' disclosure, rather than what Ryder actually teaches. While Fig. 5, to which the quoted passage on page 2 refers, shows that the multi-layered coating is applied to a finished or smoothed surface, the entire disclosure of Ryder contradicts a holding that this

smooth surface has been processed for a precise fit to a circular cylinder. In fact, Fig. 5 explicitly shows that the coating is **not** applied in a thickness corresponding to the final dimensions since it shows the coating **machined** to this thickness and to the precise fit (see the straight line at the surface of the undulating coating layers in Fig. 5, which is the same as in Figs. 3 and 4). As stated on page 2, col. 1, lines 15-20, "After a sufficient thickness of bearing material has been applied onto the machine element, the layer of bearing material is subjected to suitable mechanical operation to **reduce it** (emphasis by applicants) to the specified dimension and to provide the desired surface finish as exemplified in Fig. 3." This clearly teaches that the "desired surface finish," i.e. the **precise fit**, is obtained by the mechanical operation **after** the coating is applied and that the coating is **not** applied in a thickness corresponding to the final dimensions but in a thickness that is **reduced** to the final dimensions by the mechanical operation. This is also made clear in all of the method claims (claims 5-12) of Ryder, which specify the finishing step of obtaining the precise fit and final dimensions by the mechanical operation.

To make these essential differences between the Ryder and applicants' production method crystal clear, claim 1 has been amended to state explicitly that the production is finished


without further mechanical operations by applying the anti-friction coating in a thickness corresponding to the final dimensions to the surface which has been processed for a precise fit.

As to the combination of DE '481 with Ryder, the latter uses alternating coating layers of softer and harder material while the former uses a coating whose hardness increases from its surface in the direction of the surface to which it is applied. Neither reference teaches an anti-friction coating alloy of a harder alloy and a softer alloy wherein the proportion of the softer alloy component in the deposited coating alloy is increased with increasing coating thickness. As the Examiner states, "Ryder and '481 teach applying multiple layers." They do not teach a coating alloy of the claimed characteristic.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted claim 1 is clearly patentable, and claims 2 and 3 are believed to be allowable therewith.

A since effort having been made to overcome all grounds of rejection, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas RUMPF ET AL




Kurt Kelman, Reg. No. 18,628
Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298
Attorneys for Applicants

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Express Mail No. EV 884 791 594 US - Jan. 24, 2007

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP RCE, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 24, 2007.



Kelly Espitia

R:\USERS\imittendorf\KELMAN\RUMPF ET AL-4 - amend Jan. 07.wpd